

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/551,000	01/06/2006	Takao Suzuki	CU-4426 RJS	CU-4426 RJS 1406	
26530 7590 12/28/2006 LADAS & PARRY LLP 224 SOUTH MICHIGAN AVENUE			EXAMINER		
			PICKARD, ALISON K		
SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60604			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Cinc/100, 12			3673		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS		12/28/2006	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Astion Comments	10/551,000	SUZUKI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Alison K. Pickard	3673				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	_· action is non-final.					
'=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) 8-17 is/are pending in the application.		·				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-17</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
•	r election requirement					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
· · — · —						
	<u> </u>					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date						

Application/Control Number: 10/551,000

Art Unit: 3673

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent 3-41078 (JP '078).

Regarding claims 8 and 9, JP '078 discloses a combined oil ring 4 and coil spring 5 wherein the spring is made of shape memory alloy and expands when heated. The spring is made of wire. However, it is unclear if the wire has a rectangular cross-section. Using a rectangular wire is considered obvious. See In re Dailey 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a wire with a rectangular cross-section.

Regarding claims 12-14, JP '078 does not appear to disclose the width of the oil ring.

And, regarding claims 10, 11 and 15-17, JP '078 does not appear to disclose the ratio of the wire's thickness and width. It is not considered inventive to discover the workable or optimum ranges by routine experimentation absent the showing of criticality for such ranges. See In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the oil ring with the required width and the wire with the required ratio.

Application/Control Number: 10/551,000 Page 3

Art Unit: 3673

3. Claims 8-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Masuyama (6,860,485).

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(1)(1) and § 706.02(1)(2).

Masuyama discloses an oil ring 11 and coil spring 21 or 22 wherein the spring is made of shape memory alloy and expands when heated. The spring is made of wire. However, it is unclear if the wire has a rectangular cross-section. Using a rectangular wire is considered obvious. See In re Dailey 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a wire with a rectangular cross-section.

Application/Control Number: 10/551,000 Page 4

Art Unit: 3673

Regarding claims 12-14, Masuyama does not appear to disclose the width of the oil ring. And, regarding claims 10, 11 and 15-17, Masuyama does not appear to disclose the ratio of the wire's thickness and width. It is not considered inventive to discover the workable or optimum ranges by routine experimentation absent the showing of criticality for such ranges. See In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the oil ring with the required width and the wire with the required ratio.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bush and Webert, for example, show that it's known to make a spring with a wire having a rectangular cross-section.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alison K. Pickard whose telephone number is 571-272-7062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (10-7:30), with alternate Friday's off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tricia Engle can be reached on 571-272-6660. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/551,000

Art Unit: 3673

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alison K. Pickard Primary Examiner Art Unit 3673 Page 5

AP